

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/084,204	02/28/2002	Takako Suzuki	Q67844 6177	
7590 05/18/2004			EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			CHU, JOHN S Y	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<i>C</i> ,	•		1752	
			DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
• •	10/084,204	SUZUKI ET AL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	John S. Chu	1752				
The MAILING DATE of this communication and						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  /s will be considered timely.  I the mailing date of this communication.  ID (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Fe	bruary 2004.					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.					
, <del></del>	) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	, , . ,					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 February 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate 'atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1752

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is in response to the reconsideration received February 11, 2004.

- 1. The rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,859 is **withdrawn** in view of the approved Terminal Disclaimer submitted with the reconsideration of February 11, 2004.
- 2. The provisional rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/035,137 is **withdrawn** in view of the approved Terminal Disclaimer submitted with the reconsideration of February 11, 2004.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: the quinonediazide methyl gallate compound which is present in all the examples and is required to provide the improved resist pattern having a good shape.

The arguments by applicant's attorney has been carefully considered, however the rejection is maintained and repeated, because contrary to applicant's attorney's argument that the quinonediazide methyl gallate is not required, it is repeated that the novel properties displayed in the examples appear to require the presence of a quinonediazide methyl gallate in order to give

Art Unit: 1752

the disclosed improvement recited by applicant as found on page 4 (for forming a resist pattern not more than half a micron having a good dimensional shape).

Because the quinonediazide is seen to be a required element based on the specification, applicants are urged to include the limitations in the claims to complete the claimed composition.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KAWATA et al in view of MOMOTA et al further in view of SATO et al, ANDO et al and UETANI et al '657.

The claimed invention is drawn to a positive photoresist composition comprising

- (A) an alkali-soluble resin
- (B) a photosensitizer containing a quinonediazide ester of a compound of the following formula (I)

and,

Art Unit: 1752

(C) at least one compound of phenol group-containing compounds having structural formula (C2), (C3) or (C4) and having an elution time in the range from 6 to 30 minutes in high performance liquid chromatography, said high performance liquid chromatography being conducted under the following conditions: eluent: a mixture solvent of water: tetrahydrofuran:methanol=40:24:36 (by weight): column 4.6mm(diameter x 150 mm (length) containing 5μm silica gel as a filler (carbon content being about 15 %); column temperature: 45.0° C; and supply rate of eluent: 0.7.00 ml/min.

KAWATA ET AL discloses a positive photosensitive composition comprising an alkalisoluble resin, a quinonediazide ester and a polyphenol additive. Applicants are directed to

Art Unit: 1752

column 7 and 8, compound (b-7) which meets the claimed compound of formula (I) lacking only a methyl or ethyl group in the two central aromatic groups. KAWATA ET AL teaches a hydrogen substituted in the two central aromatic groups. As for claimed ingredient (c) in the application, KAWATA ET AL discloses a phenol compound found in column 24, line 35 defined as (C-49) which would meet the elution properties recited if processed in that manner. Further compound (C-64) in column 36, line 45 - 60 also meets the claimed elution properties.

MOMOTA ET AL teaches a photoresist composition comprising an alkali-soluble resin, a quinonediazide compound and a polyphenol additive. MOMOTA ET AL is cited to disclose that the use of alkyl groups or hydrogen groups in quinonediazide esters of polyphenol compounds is interchangeable and the skilled artisan would reasonably expect same or similar results, see the compounds of (I-1) and (I-3) found in columns 3/4, lines 60-68 and columns 5/6, lines 10-15, respectively. The compounds show a phenol compound to be esterified with quinonediazide to have hydrogens and methyl groups in the two central aromatic groups with relatively the same results with respect to resolution, sensitivity and film thickness loss, see

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of photoresist compositions to use an alkyl substituted polyphenol photosensitive compound disclosed in MOMOTA ET AL in the photoresist composition of KAWATA ET AL in place of the (B-7) as a photosensitive ingredient with the reasonable expectation of same or similar results as disclosed in KAWATA ET AL for excellent sensitivity, resolution and film thickness loss.

SATO et al discloses a positive photoresist composition comprising an alkali-soluble resin, a quinonediazide compound and a phenolic additive compound as seen in column 60,

Art Unit: 1752

compound (C8). These additive compounds provide photoresist composition increased dissolution rates.

ANDO et al discloses a positive photosensitive composition comprising an alkali-soluble resin, a quinonediazide compound and a phenol additive, see column 7, line 39 -47 These compounds meets the claimed compound found in claim 12 for (c3). The phenol additive provides for improved excellent cross sectional profile.

UETANI et al '657 discloses a positive photoresist composition comprising an alkalisoluble resin, a quinonediazide compound and a phenol compound additive, as seen in column 4, line 11-25. The additive phenolic compound provides for improved sensitivity, heat resistance and film thickness retention.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of positive photoresist composition to use known phenolic additives as disclosed in SATO et al , ANDO et al and UETANI et al in place of the additive phenolic compounds in KAWATA et al and reasonably same or similar results in improved sensitivities, improved developing properties and excellent pattern profile formation.

The arguments by applicant have been carefully considered in addition with respect to the comparative examples found in the specification. In the analysis by the examiner, it is noted that the comparative examples fail to be of proper scope, wherein a comparison to the closed prior art reference, used in the *prima facie* case of obviousness above, is missing. The Comparative Examples 2-4 demonstrate a composition missing a phenolic additive compound which lacks the disclosed improved resist pattern having a good dimensional shape, however the prior art composition to KAWATA et al disclose a photosensitizer differing only by the recited alkyl

Art Unit: 1752

groups defined as  $R_2$ . KAWATA et al disclose hydrogen groups at the  $R_2$  location in his photosensitizer and a phenolic compound differing from the claimed phenol compound defined as (C2), (C3), or (C4). Evidence demonstrating that the prior art composition lacks the same properties as disclosed, when using the prior art photosensitizer and phenolic additive may be helpful in order to over the *prima facie* case of obviousness.

## The rejection is repeated.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. UETANI et al '155 is cited to disclose that the phenol compound as defined in the current application as (C4), may be an incorrect formula, note the Certificate of Correction submitted by UETANI et al which corrects formula (I) from

$$Z_{2}$$

$$Z_{1}$$

$$Y_{1}$$

$$Y_{2}$$

$$Z_{3}$$

$$Z_{4}$$

$$R_{4}$$

$$R_{5}$$

$$R_{4}$$

$$R_{5}$$

$$(1)$$

to the correct formula shown below.

$$Z_{4} \xrightarrow{Z_{4}} Z_{7}$$

$$Y_{1} \xrightarrow{Y_{2}} Y_{2}$$

$$Z_{2} \xrightarrow{Z_{1}} O \xrightarrow{H} R_{1}$$

$$Z_{3} \xrightarrow{Z_{4}} H R_{3}$$

$$R_{6} \xrightarrow{R_{4}} R_{4}$$

$$(1)$$

Art Unit: 1752

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Chu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1329. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

The fax phone number for the USPTO is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

John S. Chu

Primary Examiner, Group 1700

J.Chu

May 13, 2004